

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response the non-final Office Action mailed on November 2, 2005. Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 12-14, 18-21, 24-25, 28, 30-31, 33-35, 46-45 are currently pending in this application, with claims 1 and 31 being independent.

No new matter has been added.

Priority

Acknowledgement of the claim for foreign priority and the receipt of a copy of the certified copy of the priority document is respectfully requested.

Title

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action contends that the title of the invention is not descriptive.

In response to this contention, a suggestion for a new title is courteously solicited.

Claim objection

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action includes an objection to the claims.

In response to this objection, claim 5 has been amended in the manner requested.

Withdrawal of this objection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

At least for the following reasons, if the allowance of these claims is not forthcoming at the very least and a new ground of rejection made, then a new non-final Office Action is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action indicates a rejection of claims 1-7, 12-13, 19-21, 24-25, 28, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,072,526 to Hashimoto et al. (Hashimoto) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,940,556 to Tamune.

This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is drawn to an image capturing system for correction of colors in an image, comprising:

a camera (2) including a lens (41), image capturing devices (31, 37), light detecting elements (31, 33, 37, 38) and a reflection surface (61) for capture of a main scene (110) in the image capturing devices (31, 37), each of the image capturing devices (31, 37) and the light detecting elements (31, 33, 37, 38) having a plurality of color channels,

the reflection surface (61) being disposed within a visual field of the camera (2) for reflection of light from the main scene (110) or a reference scene (121, 121a ~ e) disposed near the main scene (110) for reception by the light detecting elements (31, 33, 37, 38) via the lens (41),

a correction unit (72) for correction of colors in the image by the reference signal values (rn, gn, bn) obtained as a value from one pixel (136d) or an average value from a plurality of pixels (131, 131a ~ e, 136a ~ c), for each of the color channels, out of reflected light from the reference scene (121, 121a ~ e) received by the light detecting elements (31, 33, 37, 38).

Hashimoto arguably teaches an image sensing device that can correct colors corresponding to skin in a video signal.

However, the Office Action *admits* that Hashimoto fails to disclose, teach or suggest the reflection surface being disposed within a visual field of the camera for reflection of light from the main scene or a reference scene disposed near the main scene for reception by the light detecting elements via the lens (Office Action at page 3). Instead, the Office Action relies upon the teachings of Tamune for the features admittedly deficient from within Hashimoto.

Tamune arguably teaches an electronic still camera and information recording apparatus that includes a quick return mirror 71 and an image capturing device for photographing 73 (Tamune at Figure 1, column 4, lines 40-41 and 51-52).

Tamune arguably teaches the presence of a lens 83, and arguably teaches the presence of lenses 90 and 91 (Tamune at Figure 1).

Nevertheless, Tamune fails to disclose, teach or suggest the *reflection of light* from the main scene or a reference scene disposed near the main scene for *reception by the image capturing device for photographing 73* (Tamune at Figure 1).

Thus, Tamune fails to disclose, teach or suggest the reflection surface being disposed within a visual field of the camera for reflection of light from the main scene or a reference scene disposed near the main scene for reception by the light detecting elements via the lens.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action indicates a rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Tamune and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,864,911 to Zhang et al. (Zhang).

This rejection is traversed at least for the reasons provided hereinabove, and at least for the following reasons.

Claim 14 has been placed into independent form.

The above-identified application was filed under 35 U.S.C. §371 and 37 C.F.R. §§1.494 or 1.495, being based upon international application No. PCT/JP00/06294. International application No. PCT/JP00/06294 was filed with the International Bureau on September 14, 2000.

However, Zhang has a filing date of October 26, 2000. In this regard, the international filing date of September 14, 2000 for PCT/JP00/06294 is *earlier* than the filing date of October 26, 2000 for Zhang. Thus, the Zhang appears to be unavailable as prior art.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action indicates a rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Tamune and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,332 to Ellenby et al. (Ellenby).

This rejection is traversed at least for the reasons provided hereinabove, and at least for the following reasons.

Ellenby arguably teaches vision imaging devices and methods exploiting position and attitude.

However, Ellenby fails to disclose, teach or suggest the reflection surface being disposed within a visual field of the camera for reflection of light from the main scene or a reference scene disposed near the main scene for reception by the light detecting elements via the lens.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action indicates a rejection of claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Tamune and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,215,962 to Cooper.

This rejection is traversed at least for the reasons provided hereinabove, and at least for the following reasons.

Cooper arguably teaches vision imaging devices and methods exploiting position and attitude.

However, Cooper fails to disclose, teach or suggest the reflection surface being disposed within a visual field of the camera for reflection of light from the main scene or a reference scene disposed near the main scene for reception by the light detecting elements via the lens.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Newly added claims

Further note that the features found within claim 14 have been presented as newly added claim 46, which is dependent upon amended claim 1.

Claim 47 is dependent upon claim 1, claim 48 is dependent upon claim 14, claim 48 is dependent upon claim 28, and claim 50 is dependent upon claim 31.

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable

Application No. 10/088,263
Amendment dated February 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

Docket No.: KKI-004

reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753.

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

Dated: March 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Brian K. Dutton

Registration No.: 47,255
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W.
Suite 501
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-3750
Attorney for Applicant